DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 676 CE 054 092

AUTHOR Barnow, Burt S.; Aron, Laudan Y.
TITLE Survey of Government-Provided Training Programs. Background Paper No. 9.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Labor, Washington, DC. Commission on Workforce Quality and Labor Market Efficiency.
PUB DATE Sep 89
CONTRACT 99-9-4763-75-016-04
NOTE 72p.; In "Investing in People: A Strategy to Address America's Workforce Crisis" (CE 054 080).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Adults; *Disadvantaged; Educational Practices; Eligibility; *Employment Programs; Enrollment; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; *Job Training; *Policy Formation; Postsecondary Education; Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; *Program Implementation; Public Policy; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Carl D Perkins Vocational Education Act 1984; *Job Training Partnership Act 1982

ABSTRACT

This paper provides an overview of federally sponsored training programs. For the major programs identified, it discusses the level of federal support, the eligibility requirements for the program, the characteristics of the participants, and the types of training provided. An important issue for this study is the definition of training; the definition provided by the U.S. Department of Education for vocational education in the 1988 "Digest of Education Statistics" is used. This definition focuses on training as coursework for obtaining a vocational credential. Descriptions of activities that can be regarded as training but do not meet this core definition are included in the report in some instances, especially when they are provided along with vocational classroom training. The eight major federally funded training programs profiled include the following (funded under the Job Training Partnership Act): (1) Training Services for Economically Disadvantaged Youth and Adults; (2) the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program; (3) Employment and Training Assistance for Dislocated Workers; (4) the Native American Program; (5) the Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Program; (6) the Job Corps; (7) the Veterans Employment and Training Program; and (funded under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act) (8) vocational education. The paper concludes that (1) data on participants and services are very limited; (2) some overlap may be necessary to serve special target groups; (3) few participants receive occupational classroom training; and (4) few programs have formal links with employers to ensure that their labor needs are met. (11 references) (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED317676

9. SURVEY OF GOVERNMENT-PROVIDED TRAINING PROGRAMS

Burt S. Barnow

Lewin/ICF

and

Laudan Y. Aron

Lewin/ICF

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CE054092

This project was funded under Purchase Order No. 99-9-4763-75-016-04 from the U.S. Department of Labor, Commission on Workforce Quality and Labor Market Efficiency. Opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the U.S. Department of Labor, Commission on Workforce Quality and Labor Market Efficiency.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9. SURVEY OF GOVERNMENT-PROVIDED TRAINING PROGRAMS

Burt S. Barnow
Lewin/ICF

and

Laudan Y. Aron
Lewin/ICF

1. Introduction

Jobs in the U.S. economy today frequently require workers who have mastered basic skills in reading and arithmetic, and many positions also require technical or vocational skills. Members of the labor force can acquire these skills in a variety of settings -- in high schools, community colleges, private two-year institutions, four-year colleges, special government training programs, and through formal or informal training provided by employers themselves.

This paper provides an overview of federally sponsored training programs. As is documented below, the federal government provides training to workers in over a dozen major programs. Many of these programs provide similar types of training but serve special target groups that are identified by economic status, the reason why training is needed, or by particular barriers to employment. To assess the adequacy of the current system, it is important to first consider the range of programs offered and the characteristics of each program. For the major programs identified, we discuss the level of federal support, the eligibility requirements for the program, the characteristics of the participants, and the types of training provided.

Unfortunately, there are many gaps in the available data. Although federal expenditures are available for all the programs of interest, we were not always able to identify the funds spent specifically on training for programs that provide services in addition to training. Data on the characteristics of participants vary considerably across programs. In some cases, detailed data about the participants and the type of training they receive are available, but for one major program (vocational education), we were unable to obtain estimates of the number of participants served.

An important issue for this study is the definition of training. Although any definition of training focuses on the acquisition of skills, the term training can be defined narrowly, to include only situations where vocational skills are taught in a classroom setting, or broadly, to include remedial and basic skills instruction, informal instruction by employers, and supportive activities such as job search assistance. Thus, the definition must address the issues of content and setting.

For this report, we will use the definition provided by the U.S. Department of Education for vocational education in the 1988 Digest of Education Statistics as the core definition of training: training is defined as coursework, either full- or part-time, in an occupational or technical field for the purpose of obtaining a vocational credential, such as a vocational certificate, occupational license, or other vocational diploma or degree. This definition differs from the definitions used by some government agencies, but it will enable us to identify training as the term is perhaps most commonly understood.

Many government programs provide activities and services that almost meet the definition provided above, and such activities are sometimes (but not always) classified as training by the agencies. Wherever possible, we have included these activities in the report, especially when they are provided along with vocational classroom training, but we have tried to distinguish them from training that meets our core definition of training. Examples of these related activities include:

- Basic skills and remedial education. These programs provide participants with classroom instruction in reading, arithmetic, and other academic skills. The programs are often intended to lead to a GED or high school diploma.

- On-the-job training. These programs consist of employment opportunities with individual employers. The employer typically receives a payment of 50 percent of wages paid to the participant for the first six months of employment to cover the cost of formal and informal training.

- Work supplementation and grant diversion. These programs are operated through AFDC programs, and they are similar to on-the-job training. Under these programs, AFDC funds are used to subsidize employment experiences with nonprofit and for-profit employers for a limited period of time. The programs are intended to provide informal training to the participants, with the goal of having employers retain the participants after the subsidies expire.

- Work experience and community work experience programs (CWEP). Work experience programs operated under the Job Training Partnership Act and CWEP programs operated under AFDC programs provide work experience for participants with government or nonprofit agencies and organizations. Work experience participants in JTPA programs generally are paid the minimum wage. In CWEP programs, the participants are not paid and are considered to be performing the work in exchange for the AFDC benefits. A goal in both programs is for the participants to gain work experience that will help them qualify for an unsubsidized job.

- Job search assistance. Job search assistance is provided to participants in JTPA, AFDC, and Food Stamp programs to help the participants improve their job search methods. These programs typically do not provide occupational training.

There are some government programs that we have excluded because they are beyond the scope of this report. Among these are:

- The employment service. The employment service (or job service) provides assistance to individuals seeking employment. The program is operated through state employment security agencies. The employment service operates primarily as a labor exchange, and it takes job orders from employers and refers qualified workers to relevant openings. In addition, the employment service provides testing, counseling, and assessment of applicants.

- Apprenticeship. The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training works with the private sector in certifying apprenticeship programs and promoting the concept of apprenticeship. However, the government does not sponsor or fund the training of apprentices.

- Regular schooling and adult basic and remedial education. We have omitted programs that are solely oriented toward providing educational skills and credentials. Thus, high school programs leading to a diploma, postsecondary programs leading to a baccalaureate degree, and adult education programs leading to a GED or other educational credentials are not included in the study.

- State and local training programs. Programs funded entirely by state and local governments are not included in the study. However, programs that are partially or fully funded by the federal government are included, even if they are administered at the state or local level.

- Government training of civilian and uniformed personnel. The federal government provides training for civilian employees (e.g., general management training and training for air traffic controllers) and for members of the armed forces. These programs are excluded from the report.

The next eight sections of the report provide information about the major federally funded training programs. Section 10 provides a summary and conclusions.

2. The Job Training Partnership Act

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) authorizes the nation's major employment and training program for individuals with specific

labor market needs. JTPA was passed in 1982 to replace the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), and the programs began operation in 1983. The specific programs established by JTPA are authorized in Titles II, III, and IV of the Act, and each of the major programs is described below. The major JTPA programs include training services for economically disadvantaged youth and adults (Title II-A), the summer youth employment and training program (Title II-B), employment and training services for dislocated workers (Title III), employment and training programs for native Americans and migrant and seasonal farm workers (Title IV-A), the Job Corps (Title IV-B), and veterans' employment and training programs (Title IV-C). Each of the JTPA programs have specific eligibility requirements, although an individual may qualify for more than one program.

2.1 Training Services for Economically Disadvantaged Youth and Adults

The training programs for economically disadvantaged youth and adults are authorized by Title II-A of JTPA. To be eligible for the program, an individual must meet one of five criteria for being considered economically disadvantaged: (1) receives, or is a member of a family which receives, cash welfare payments; (2) has, or is a member of a family which has, family income for the six-month period prior to application which, in relation to family size, was not above the higher of the poverty level set by the Office of Management and Budget or 70 percent of the lower living standard income level; (3) is receiving food stamps; (4) is a foster child on whose behalf state or local payments are made; and (5) is an adult handicapped person whose own income meets

one of the first two criteria. In addition, in each local service delivery area, up to 10 percent of the participants enrolled may not be economically disadvantaged if they have other barriers to employment. The Act gives as examples displaced homemakers, school dropouts, teenage parents, handicapped individuals, older workers, veterans, offenders, substance abusers, and individuals with limited English proficiency.

For program year 1987 (July 1, 1987 through June 30, 1988), expenditures for the Title II-A program were $1.9 billion.[1] The statute requires that at least 70 percent of the funds be spent on training (rather than administration, needs-based payments, and support services), but under certain circumstances these limits may be waived.[2] During PY 1987, 796,600 participants enrolled in Title II-A programs, and 763,900 terminated.[3] Nearly 1.1 million individuals were served by local service delivery areas in PY 1987. The number of participants on board at the end of each quarter ranged from 333,200 to 448,100 participants. The median length of stay for Title II-A participants in PY 1987 was 14.6 weeks.

The characteristics of Title II-A enrollees and terminees in PY 1987 are presented in Table 1 and Table 2. The more detailed data in Table 1 are based on a probability sample of local programs, and the data in Table 2 are from administrative data. Slightly more than half of the participants were women. The statute requires that at least 40 percent of the funds be spent on youth under age 22, so it is not surprising that slightly over 40 percent of the participants are youth. Slightly over fifty percent of the participants are white non-Hispanics, about one third are black non-Hispanics, about one-eighth are Hispanics,

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF TITLE IIA ENROLLEES IN EACH INITIAL PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS: PARTICIPANTS NEWLY ENROLLED IN JTPA DURING FY 1987 (JULY 1987 - JUNE 1988)

Selected Characteristics	Total	Initial Program Assignment				
		CT[1]	OJT	JSA	WE	Other Services
Total Enrollees	796,600	286,000	170,900	153,800	54,900	131,000
Sex						
Male	47	37	57	54	47	51
Female	53	63	43	46	53	49
Minority Status						
White (excluding Hispanic)	53	48	62	53	49	56
Black (excluding Hispanic)	32	36	25	34	37	32
Hispanic	11	13	11	10	12	8
Other	3	3	3	3	3	4
Age at Enrollment						
Younger than 19	26	24	10	19	59	45
19-21	15	14	18	15	16	12
22-29	26	27	34	26	11	18
30-34	24	27	29	26	8	17
45-54	5	5	5	6	3	5
55 and older	4	3	4	8	3	3
Economically Disadvantaged	93	93	94	92	95	93
Unemployment Compensation Claimant at Application	5	4	6	6	1	4
Participants Not Working During the 26 Weeks Prior to Application	54	60	41	53	60	55
Handicapped	11	10	7	12	21	13
Veteran at Application	8	5	11	11	2	7
Receiving Public Assistance at Application						
AFDC	23	31	15	18	18	19
Cash Public Assistance (AFDC, General, Refugee, SSI)	29	38	20	27	22	24
Food Stamps	31	38	27	28	24	30
Any public assistance (cash and/or noncash)	41	50	34	38	34	40
Adult Welfare[2]	17	25	13	16	6	10
Other Adult Assistance	9	9	13	10	4	8
Youth (age <22)	15	16	8	11	24	22
Average Monthly Amount (all types of assistance)[3]	$314	$326	$299	$310	$289	$304
Education Status						
School dropout	27	33	25	26	17	23
Student (HS or Less)	18	13	5	13	55	36
High School Graduate or Equivalent (no post HS)	39	40	50	41	20	28
Post High School	16	14	20	20	9	14

1 Program assignments include classroom training (CT), on-the-job training (OJT), job search assistance (JSA), and work experience (WE).

2 Receiving AFDC, General Assistance and/or Refugee Assistance and at least 22 years of age at enrollment.

3 These data items are not available prior to the second quarter of PY 1986.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Division of Performance Management and Evaluation, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Development. Summary of JTQS Data for JTPA Title IIA and III Enrollments and Terminations During FY 1987 (December 1988).

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF PY 1987 TITLE II-A TERMINEES
FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

	Adults	Youth
Total Number of Terminees	447,000	371,000
Male	55%	50%
Female	46	50
Age 55 and Over	4	--
Dropout	27	27
High School Graduate	73	32
Welfare	29	23
Single with Dependent under 18	30	0
White	54	44
Black	30	37
Hispanic	12	16
Alaskan/American Indian	1	1
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	2
Handicapped	9	13
Limited English	5	4
Unemployment Insurance Claimant	8	1
Unemployed 15 or More Weeks of Prior 26	50	--

Source: Unpublished Department of Labor data based on JTPA Annual Status Reports (JASR).

and about 3 percent belong to other ethnic groups. The participants displayed a wide range of educational backgrounds. Over one-quarter were dropouts, but 16 percent had some postsecondary education.

The data in Table 1 indicate that the vast majority of the enrollees were economically disadvantaged. Ninety-three percent met the criteria in the statute for being classified as economically disadvantaged. Forty-one percent received some form of public assistance, and 23 percent received Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Over half, 54 percent, did not work in the 26 weeks prior to applying for JTPA.

The statute describes 28 different activities that are authorized under Title II-A, but the activities are usually summarized in five broad categories: classroom training, on-the-job training, job search assistance, work experience, and other services.

The data in Table 3 show the distribution of participants among activities in PY 1987 for all enrollees, youth, public assistance recipients, and dropouts. Classroom training (CT) is the most common activity, given to 36 percent of the participants. Twenty-two percent of the participants were initially assigned to on-the-job training (OJT), 19 percent received job search assistance (JSA), 7 percent received work experience (WE), and 16 percent received other services.[4] There are some differences in enrollment patterns for participants with different backgrounds. For example, youth, public assistance recipients, and dropouts tend to be enrolled in on-the-job training less often than others.

TABLE 3

TITLE II-A INITIAL PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT DISTRIBUTIONS
FOR PARTICIPANTS NEWLY ENROLLED IN JTPA DURING PY 1987
(JULY 1987 - JUNE 1988)

Initial Program Assignment	All Participants	Youth	Public Assistance	School Dropouts
Classroom training	36	34	43	44
On-the-job training	22	15	18	20
Job search assistance	19	16	18	19
Work experience	7	13	6	4
Other Services	16	23	16	14
Total	100	100[1]	100[1]	100[1]

[1] Numerical and/or percentage distributions may not add precisely to totals due to rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Division of Performance Management and Evaluation, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Development. Summary of JTOS Data for JTPA Title IIA and III Enrollments and Terminations During PY 1987 (December 1988).

JTPA Title II-A programs are based on a partnership of federal, state, and local government and the private sector. The federal funds are first allocated by a formula based on unemployment and the number of economically disadvantaged individuals to the states. The states then allocate 78 percent of the funds, using the same formula, to local units of government referred to as "service delivery areas" (SDAs), which are responsible for administering the program. The remaining funds are used for state education and coordination grants (8 percent), training programs for older workers (3 percent), administration (5 percent), and for incentive grants and technical assistance (6 percent).

Two aspects of the Title II structure play a major role in focusing the system on the needs of the private sector, helping to assure that training is structured to meet employer needs: private industry councils and performance standards. Because the JTPA Title II-A system appears to have stronger requirements in these areas than other government training programs, we describe them below.

Private Industry Councils

Each SDA designated by the governor is required by the Act to establish a private industry council (PIC). The members of the PIC are appointed by the chief elected official(s) of the SDA, and at least 51 percent of the members must be representatives of the private sector selected from nominations made by a general purpose business organization (e.g., the local chamber of commerce). The remaining PIC members may be representatives of organized labor, education agencies, the employment service, community based organizations, economic

development agencies, and other interested parties. The chief elected official(s) of the SDA initially determines the size of the PIC, and PIC members thereafter determine the size.

The PICs are given substantial responsibility under Section 103 of JTPA. They are responsible for policy guidance and oversight of the program, and they must approve the SDA's job training plan. The job training plan provides detailed plans for administering the JTPA program, procedures for identifying and selecting participants, performance goals for the program, and procedures for selecting service providers. PICs also have the option to prepare the plan and/or administer the JTPA program if they wish, although fewer than 20 percent do so.

In a review of the literature on PICs, The National Commission for Employment Policy (1987) notes that various studies have reached conflicting conclusions on the importance of the PIC role. However, the commission concludes, "the preponderance of evidence seems to indicate that their role has been on the whole very positive and, in most cases, does not seem to be lessening over the passage of time." (p. 44.)

Performance Standards

Another feature of JTPA that encourages SDAs to integrate the needs of the private sector and JTPA activities, is the performance standards system. The Secretary of Labor is required, by Section 106 of the Act, to issue performance standards that indicate acceptable levels of performance. The Secretary has also issued optional regression models that can be used to modify the expected level of performance

based on the characteristics of the participants served and local economic conditions. Governors may modify the standards or adjustment procedures, and they may add additional standards of their own. SDAs that exceed standards can receive incentive funds from the six-percent set-aside funds, and SDAs that fail to meet standards two years in a row can be reorganized by the governor.

The Title II-A performance standards issued by the Secretary include program outcomes such as the entered employment rate and the wage at placement. Recently, the Secretary added standards on postprogram performance dealing with earnings and employment in the 13 weeks following termination from JTPA. The performance standards for youth include attainment of employment "competencies" specified by the PIC. This provision clearly encourages integration of private sector needs with the operation of the training programs.

Because the performance standards provide rewards and sanctions for SDAs with very good or very poor performance, they would be expected to encourage SDAs to target their activities to the needs of the private sector. However, a recent study by SRI International (1988) concluded that other factors (e.g., the availability of local providers and economic conditions) were as important as performance standards in influencing the service mix.

2.2 Summer Youth Employment and Training Program

Title II-B of JTPA authorizes the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program. This program, which serves economically disadvantaged youth between the ages of 16 and 21, is designed to assist youth in

obtaining part-time, minimum wage work during the summer, and it often provides them with their first working experience.[5]

The law states that funds for Title II-B programs can be used for (1) basic and remedial education, institutional and on-the-job training, work experience programs, employment counseling, occupational training, preparation for work, outreach and enrollment activities, employability assessment, job referral and placement, job search and job club activities, and any other employment or job training activity designed to give employment to eligible individuals or prepare them for, and place them in, employment; and (2) supportive services necessary to enable such individuals to participate in the program.

For FY 1988, $802 million were appropriated for summer youth programs (see Table 4).[6] The largest component of expenditures, 45 percent, was for support services (including stipends), followed by training services, which accounted for another 41 percent. The 1986 JTPA amendments require SDAs to assess all participants for reading and mathematical skills and to provide remediation. The Department of Labor has not issued regulations defining training for the Title II-B program, so some of the funds reported as training costs may represent expenditures on activities not usually considered training. Data on the costs and number of participants by type of training are not available.

The socioeconomic characteristics of youth participating in the summer programs during FY 1988 are also shown in Table 4. The number of males and females in the program is roughly equal, and the largest number of youth is in the 16 to 17 year-old age group. Over 85 percent of the participants are students, while another 10 percent have either

TABLE 4

TITLE II-B SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAMS
FISCAL YEAR 1988

	Number	Percent
Performance and Cost Indicators		
Participants Served	689,862	
Total Cost Availability	802,119,259	
Total Accrued Costs	698,648,427	
Training Services	287,348,915	41%
Support Services	317,614,886	45
Administrative Services	93,684,625	13
Cost Per Participant	1,092	
Characteristics of Youth Served		
SEX		
Male	324,772	51
Female	315,090	49
AGE		
14 - 15	242,386	38
16 - 17	261,753	41
18 - 21	135,723	21
EDUCATION		
School Dropout	28,000	4
Student	548,922	86
High School Graduate or Equivalent or Above	62,940	10
RACE/ETHNICITY		
White	198,425	31
Black	262,309	41
Hispanic	150,682	24
Alaskan/American Indian	8,884	1
Asian/Pacific Island	19,562	3
Single HOH With Dependent Under 18	15,758	2
Limited English	72,073	11
Handicapped	81,863	13

Data exclude U.S. Virgin Island and the Pacific insular areas.

Source: Unpublished data, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

graduated from or continued past high school. Forty-one percent of all participants are black, another 31 percent are white, and 24 percent are of Hispanic origin. In total, almost 70 percent of youth participating in the summer employment and training programs are minority group members.

2.3 Employment and Training Assistance for Dislocated Workers

Title III of JTPA authorizes state programs to provide assistance to dislocated workers. The Title III program is a state program that serves dislocated workers through job search assistance, classroom training, on-the-job training, relocation assistance, pre-layoff assistance, relocation, and other means. The eligibility requirements for Title III are not as specific as the requirements for Title II programs, and states have considerable flexibility in determining which dislocated workers they choose to serve.[7]

Three-quarters of the Title III funds are distributed to states by a formula based on unemployment and long-term unemployment. The remaining funds are available to the Secretary of Labor for discretionary projects. Unlike the other JTPA programs, states are required to match the federal funds, with the extent of the match determined by the state's unemployment rate relative to the national rate. States may operate their Title III programs through the SDAs, but they are not required to do so.

Congressional interest in dislocated workers remained strong after the passage of JTPA. Among other things, the Congress was concerned whether the original Title III program provided the best distribution of

funds across and within states, whether dislocated workers received appropriate services, whether workers whose job losses resulted from mass layoffs and plant closings were receiving enough service, and whether the services received by such workers were timely. To deal with these concerns, two major laws were enacted in the summer of 1988. The Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (WARN), enacted in July 1988, requires employers in certain circumstances to provide 60 days advance notice to workers and the state dislocated worker unit in the event of a mass layoff or plant closing. In August 1988, Subpart D of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act included the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act (EDWAA), which modified the JTPA Title III program substantially.

EDWAA changed a number of features in the Title III program. Our assessment of the legislation is that the most significant changes are: (1) the mandate for the establishment and use of state rapid response units; (2) the mandate that states pass on at least 60 percent of the funds to substate areas; and (3) the requirement that at least 50 percent of the sub-state area funds be spent on training rather than job search assistance and related activities. Other provisions of EDWAA may have significant impacts, but these three areas represent significant deviations from the current program. Because of these changes, which will become effective on July 1, 1989, the information provided below on the characteristics and activities in Title III may not reflect how the Title III program will operate later this year.

Expenditures for Title III programs in PY 1987 were approximately $172 million. An estimated 98,200 displaced workers entered Title III

programs during PY 1987, and 183,000 participants were served during the year. The average length of stay in the program was 16.3 weeks.

Table 5 and Table 6 provide characteristics of the Title III enrollees and terminees during PY 1987. The characteristics of Title III participants differ considerably from those of Title II-A participants. A majority of Title III participants in PY 1987 were males (about 60 percent), and most Title III participants, 84 percent, had at least a high school education. As would be expected, the Title III participants were older than Title II-A participants. Under 5 percent of the participants were under age 22, 70 percent were between 22 and 44, and 27 percent were age 45 and older. Approximately one-quarter of the enrollees were members of minority groups, and 30 percent of the enrollees were economically disadvantaged. Only six percent of the enrollees received public assistance, but over half (52 percent) were receiving unemployment compensation at application.

The activity mix for Title III is heavily concentrated in job search assistance and classroom training, as is shown in Table 7. Forty-four percent of the participants in PY 1987 were enrolled in job search assistance, and 28 percent were enrolled in classroom training. The remaining participants were evenly split between on-the-job training and other activities, with 14 percent in each. As noted above, when the EDWAA provisions become effective, the proportion of enrollees receiving training is likely to increase significantly.

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF TITLE III ENROLLEES IN EACH INITIAL PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS: PARTICIPANTS NEWLY ENROLLED IN JTPA DURING PY 1987 (JULY 1987 - JUNE 1988)

Selected Characteristics	Initial Program Assignment				
	Total	CT[1]	OJT	JSA	Other Services
Total Enrollees	98,200	27,700	13,900	42,400	14,100
Sex					
Male	59	54	70	60	56
Female	41	46	30	40	44
Minority Status					
White (excluding Hispanic)	76	78	79	77	71
Black (excluding Hispanic)	17	16	15	16	21
Hispanic	5	4	4	5	7
Other	2	3	1	2	1
Age at Enrollment					
Younger than 19	-	1	1	-	-
19-21	3	3	5	3	3
22-29	22	23	29	20	18
30-34	48	49	43	49	46
45-54	19	18	17	19	24
55 and older	8	7	5	9	9
Economically Disadvantaged	30	30	32	30	30
Unemployment Compensation Claimant at Application	52	48	38	60	47
Participants Not Working During the 26 Weeks Prior to Application	22	22	24	23	19
Handicapped	3	4	3	3	3
Veteran at Application	21	18	22	22	20
Receiving Public Assistance at Application					
AFDC	1	2	1	1	1
Cash Public Assistance (AFDC, General, Refugee, SSI)	2	3	3	1	2
Food Stamps	4	3	5	5	6
Any public assistance (cash and/or noncash)	6	6	6	6	7
Adult Welfare[2]	2	3	2	1	1
Other Adult Assistance	4	3	4	5	6
Youth (age <22)	-	-	-	-	-
Average Monthly Amount (all types of assistance)	$269	$314	$228	$227	$255
Education Status					
School dropout	16	13	22	14	21
Student (HS or Less)	1	1	1	1	1
High School Graduate or Equivalent (no post HS)	52	53	55	49	54
Post High School	32	33	22	36	24

[1] Program assignments include classroom training (CT), on-the-job traininig (OJT), job search assistance (JSA), and work experience (WE).

[2] Receiving AFDC, General Assistance and/or Refugee Assistance and at least 22 years of age at enrollment.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Division of Performance Management and Evaluation, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Development. Summary of JTQS Data for JTPA Title IIA and III Enrollments and Terminations During PY 1987 (December 1988).

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF PY 1987 TITLE III TERMINEES BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Total Number of Terminees	126,582
Male	62%
Female	38
Age 16 - 21	4
Age 22 - 54	88
Age 55 and Over	8
White	73
Black	17
Hispanic	9
Alaskan/American Indian	1
Asian/Pacific Islander	2
Limited English	3
Unemployment Insurance Claimant	52
Unemployed 15 or More Weeks of Prior 26	42

Source: Unpublished Department of Labor data based on JTPA Annual Status Reports (JASR).

TABLE 7

TITLE III INITIAL PROGRAM
ASSIGNMENT FOR PY 1987

	Percent
Job Search Assistance	44
Classroom Training	28
On-the-job-Training	14
Other	14

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Division of Performance Management and Evaluation, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Development. Summary of JTQS Data for JTPA Title IIA and III Enrollments and Terminations During PY 1987 (December 1988).

2.4 Native American Program

The Native American Program provides employment and training services to members of Indian, native Alaskan, and native Hawaiian communities to address the particular unemployment and economic disadvantages these groups face. Like other JTPA Title IV programs, the Native American program is administered at the national level by the Office of Job Training Programs in the Employment and Training Administration. Funds for the program are distributed to Indian tribes, bands, or groups representing the interests of Native Americans. Indian grantees are given a great deal of autonomy in planning and operating programs suited to local conditions and individual group needs. They also help in formulating program regulations and performance standards. In addition to providing these grants, the Employment and Training Administration is responsible for making employment and training services available to nonreservation Native Americans.

By law, the Native American program is allocated 3.3 percent of the amount allocated to JTPA Title II-A programs. For PY 1987, $59.7 million was allocated to 188 grantees; this level of funding supported an average enrollment level of 7,400 at a cost of $8,127 per service year.[8] Training and employment costs amounted to $27 million and $18 million, respectively (see Table 8). Almost half of total training costs were devoted to training assistance ($13.4 million), 36 percent to classroom training ($9.8 million), and 14 percent to on-the-job training ($3.9 million).[9] Table 9 indicates the number of participants receiving various services with these funds. Of the 33,000 individuals participating in the program in PY 1987, 9,500 received classroom

TABLE 8

NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAM
COST INDICATORS
PROGRAM YEAR 1987

	Expenditures
Training Costs	27,101,967
Classroom Training	9.753,423
On-the-Job Training	3,885,734
Tryout Employment	61,034
Training Assistance	13,401,776
Employment Costs	18,583,428
Work Experience	12,087,570
Community Service Employment	6,495,858
Other Costs	2,750,831
General Activities (non E/T)	524,153
Supportive Services (non E/T)	2,226,678
Administration	12,385,304
Total	60,821,530
Community Benefit Projects	435,126

Note: National percentages are calculated on values accumulated from grants where all appropriate reports are present and error free.

Source: Unpublished data, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE 9

NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAM
PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
PROGRAM YEAR 1987

	Number	Percent
Participation and Termination Summary		
Total Participants	32,904	100.0
Classroom Training[1]	9,501	28.9
On-the-Job Training	3,181	9.7
Tryout Employment	76	0.2
Work Experience	7,287	22.2
Community Service Employment	2,063	6.3
Total Terminations	27,191	82.6
Entered Unsubsidized Employment	14,203	43.2
Direct	7,195	21.9
Indirect from Classroom	2,762	8.4
Indirect from O-J-T	2,037	6.2
Indirect from Tryout Employment	40	0.1
Indirect from Work Experience	1,553	4.7
Indirect from Community Service Employment	616	1.9
Additional Positive Terminations	8,916	27.1
Entered Non-Section 401 Training	533	1.6
Returned to Full-Time School	1,496	4.6
Completed Major Level of Education	1,236	3.8
Other Successful Completion of Activity	5,651	17.2
Other Terminations	4,072	12.4
Total Current Participants	5,713	17.4
Characteristics of Terminees		
Sex		
Male	13,894	50.8
Female	13,297	49.2
Age		
14-15	565	2.0
16-21	7,025	25.7
22-24	17,487	64.2
45 and Over	2,114	8.1
Education		
School Dropout: 8th Grade or Less	1,349	5.3
School Dropout: 9th-12th Grade	5,548	20.5
Student, High School or Less	2,145	7.8
High School Grad. or Equivalent, or Above	18,149	66.4
Family		
Single Head of Household w/ Dep. Children	5,119	n/a
Other		
Limited English Language. Proficiency	1,345	n/a
Handicapped	646	
Offender	2,138	
Welfare Recipient	6,125	
Transiency	1,710	
Labor Force Status at Entry		
Unemployed: Long-Term	10,314	n/a
Not in Labor Force	6,742	
Average Weeks Participated	16	
Earnings and Wage Data		
Average Earnings (52 Weeks Preprogram)	4,225	
Average Hourly Wage at Termination	5.19	

[1] Training categories do not sum to total since some participants do not receive formal training and others receive more than one type of training.

Source: Unpublished data, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

training, 3,200 received on-the-job training, 7,300 obtained work experience, and 2,000 individuals participated in community service employment.

Characteristics of program participants are shown in Table 9 for terminees in PY 1987. Half of the participants were male and half were female. Over 60 percent were between the ages of 22 and 44, and the majority had graduated from high school. More than 10,000 terminees were unemployed, and close to 7,000 were not in the labor force. The average length of stay in the program was 16 weeks.

2.5 Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Program

Another JTPA Title IV program is designed to assist agricultural workers who are affected by chronic seasonal unemployment and underemployment, and by the displacement effects of new technology and mechanization. The federally administered Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker (MSFW) Program helps migrant and seasonal farmworkers find unsubsidized agricultural and nonagricultural employment. The program is operated by nonprofit organizations and state and local government agencies which are selected on a competitive basis every two years. Participants are provided with a variety of employment and training services, including classroom and on-the-job training, work experience, and tryout employment. They are also given job referrals and placement, relocation and housing assistance, transportation, health and medical care, various types of emergency assistance, and other support services.

Program year 1987 was the first year of the two-year competitive funding cycle. The budget allocation was $59.6 million.[10] By law, a

minimum of 94 percent of annual program appropriation must be given to states (except Alaska, Rhode Island, and the District of Columbia) and Puerto Rico; states received a total of $57.3 million in PY 1987 on a formula basis. The remaining $2.3 million was retained in a discretionary national account to support a migrant housing program, various types of technical assistance, and other national activities. With the state funds, and those left over from the previous program year, 46,800 individuals were served. Sixty-eight grants were given to private non-profit organizations, and eight were awarded to public agencies.

For PY 1988, Congress has added an additional $5.9 million to the basic appropriation of $59.6 million for the program. Additional funds were provided in order to serve the growing number of eligible migrant and seasonal farmworkers resulting from the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. Estimates indicate that this legislation has added 650,000 individuals to the eligible MSFW population. Half of the $5.9 million increase was allocated to the states using regular Census estimates of the farmworker population; the other half was allocated to states based on new estimates of the recently legalized group provided by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Data on terminees indicate that over 6,000 participants received classroom training, 7,000 received on-the-job training, and another 4,500 received tryout employment, training assistance, and work experience (see Table 10). Classroom training comprised 34 percent of program costs ($18.8 million). On-the-job training accounted for

TABLE 10

MIGRANT AND SEASONAL FARMWORKER PROGRAM
PERFORMANCE AND COST INDICATORS
PROGRAM YEAR 1987

	Total	Percent
Performance Indicators		
Participants	46,834	
Terminations	37,856	100%
Training Received by Terminees		
Classroom Training	6,536	17
On-the-Job Training	7,076	19
Tryout Employment	281	1
Training Assistance	2,987	8
Work Experience	1,307	3
Services Only	19,669	52
Total Current Participants	8,978	
Cost Indicators		
Total	$56,050,776	
Classroom Training	18,805,948	34
On-the-Job Training	12,844,760	23
Tryout Employment	506,534	1
Training Assistance	5,497,459	10
Total Working Experience	4,548,080	8
Services Only	2,881,777	5
Administration	10,966,218	20

Source: Unpublished data, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

another 23 percent of total costs ($12.8 million). Three quarters of program costs were devoted to some form of training activity.

Table 11 shows various socioeconomic characteristics of program participants in PY 1987. Almost half of the 38,000 terminees in PY 1987 were migrant farmworkers, and slightly over half were seasonal farmworkers. The majority, 24,000, were male, and most participants were between the ages of 22 and 44. The largest race/ethnic group was Hispanics, totaling almost 23,000. This was followed by blacks (7,000) and then whites (6,500).

2.6 Job Corps

Job Corps is a federally administered training and employment program for economically disadvantaged youth between the ages of 16 and 21. Originally established in 1964 under the Economic Opportunity Act, Job Corps is currently authorized under Title IV-B of JTPA. The purpose of the program, as stated in the Act, is "to assist young individuals who need and can benefit from an unusually intensive program, operated in a group setting, to become more responsible, employable and productive citizens; and to do so in a way that contributes, where feasible, to the development of national, state and community resources, and to the development and dissemination of techniques for working with the disadvantaged that can be widely utilized by public and private institutions and agencies" (Sec. 421).

Job Corps services are typically administered in a residential setting, although nonresidential services are also authorized. Job Corps centers provide youth with a wide variety of services, including

TABLE 11

MIGRANT AND SEASONAL FARMWORKER PROGRAM
CHARACTERISTICS OF TERMINEES
PROGRAM YEAR 1987

Characteristics of Terminees

	Total	Percent
Total	37,856	
Migrant	18,229	48%
Seasonal	19,627	52
SEX		
Male	24,262	64
Female	13,594	36
AGE		
14-15	169	0.4
16-21	7,812	21
22-44	24,024	63
45 and Over	5,851	15
EDUCATION		
School Dropout 8th or Less	13,717	36
School Dropout 9th-12th	11,213	30
Student High School or Less	737	2
High School Grade or Above	12,189	32
RACE/ETHNICITY		
White	6,568	17
Black	7,037	19
Hispanic	22,889	60
American Indian or Alaskan Native	953	3
Asian or Pacific Islander	409	1
Limited English Proficiency	11,833	31
Handicapped	546	1
Welfare Recipient	4,496	12
Single Head of Household	4,789	13
Unemployed at Entry	30,520	81
Average Weeks Participated	12	
Average Earnings (52 Weeks Preprogram)	$3,214	
Average Hourly Wage at Termination	$ 4.67	

Source: Unpublished data, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

basic education, vocational skills training, and work experience, in addition to support services such as subsistence, clothing, health care, and recreation. The centers are administered by government, labor, and private sector organizations. In PY 1987, 106 Job Corps centers were in operation, 76 of which were managed and operated by major corporations and nonprofit organizations under contract with the Department of Labor.[11] Another 30 centers were run by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.[12] Labor unions and trade associations also provide training in Job Corps centers.

Between 1977 and 1981, Jobs Corps' capacity was doubled. Since 1982, annual appropriations have averaged around $600 million, a level of funding sufficient to support approximately 40,500 service years. Since the average length of stay in the program is less than one year, roughly 100,000 individual youths are served each year. For PY 1987, Job Corps was appropriated $656 million (see Table 12). Over 38,000 service years were provided, and 103,000 individuals were served. Program costs averaged $16,000 per service year and $10,000 per participant. Table 12 also shows program costs by type of service category. Over 71 percent of the annual cost of Job Corps was spent on center operations, which includes training and educational costs. Within the category of center operation costs, over 72 percent was for residential living and various administrative costs. Vocational training was the third largest cost component, comprising 15 percent of total center operation costs. During PY 1987, Job Corps spent $73 million on vocational training and $34 million on basic education.

TABLE 12

JOB CORPS
PERFORMANCE AND COST INDICATORS
PROGRAM YEAR 1987

Performance Indicators

Number of Job Corps Centers	106
Corpsmember Service Years (CMSY)	38,684
New Enrollees Served	65,150
Total Participants	103,806
Total Terminations	66,233
Average Length of Stay (months)	7.0

Placement Outcomes for Terminees	For Terminees Reported		Estimate For All Terminees	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent[1]
Employment	36,083	67.9%	40,750	61.5%
Further Education	8,565	16.1	9,673	14.6
Total Positive Outcomes	44,648	84.0	50,423	76.1

Cost Indicators

Appropriation ($ -000-) $656,350[2]

Job Corps by Category	Amount ($-000-)	As Percent Of Total
Enrollee Transportation	9,174	1.4%
Enrollee Allowances	69,436	10.2
Outreach, Screening, Placement	31,171	4.6
Center Operations	487,125	71.8
National Management Systems	529	0.1
National Administrative Costs	3,594	0.5
Capital Equipment	8,188	1.2
Vehicle Amortization	3,719	0.6
VST Materials	10,947	1.6
Arch/Engr and Property Mgmt Support	8,888	1.3
Center Facility Leases	4,214	0.6
Construction/Rehab/Facility Acquisition	41,614	6.1
TOTAL	678,599[2]	100.0%

Break-Out of Center Operations Costs

Residential Living	159,777	32.8%
Basic Education	34,586	7.1
Vocational Training	73,069	15.0
Medical and Dental	26,305	5.4
Administrative/Management/Other	193,388	39.7
TOTAL	487,125	100.0%

Unit Costs (Reflects all costs except construction/rehab/facility acquisition).

Cost Per Corpsmember Service Year	16,466
Cost Per New Enrollee	9,777
Cost Per Placement	12,633

1 Most Job Corps enrollees receive their training away from their communities, which makes it difficult for placement agencies to locate and report on many of them. The estimation procedure assumes, conservatively, that terminees not located are placed only through self-placement of rates equal to those who are located.

2 Costs can differ from appropriations due to time differences between obligations and expenditures.

Source: Job Corps In Brief: Program Year 1987, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

These figures correspond to 11 and 5 percent of total annual costs, respectively.

Corpsmembers spend half of their time receiving vocational training and the remainder in basic education classes. Vocational skills training consists of a number of activities including instruction, demonstration and practice, shop-type classes, and "hands-on experience." Vocational curricula are competency-based and typically fall into the following types of occupational categories: business and clerical skills, word processing, culinary arts, health occupations, automotive trades, construction trades, welding, and building and apartment maintenance.

The principal target group for Job Corps is severely disadvantaged youth. The socioeconomic characteristics of Job Corps enrollees in PY 1987 are shown in Table 13. The data are consistent with one federal publication's description of a typical program participant: "an 18-year-old high school dropout who reads at the elementary school level, comes from a poor family, is a minority group member, has never held a regular job, and was living in an environment characterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive home life, or other disorienting conditions impairing his (her) ability to successfully participate in other programs providing training, education or assistance."[13] As Table 13 indicates, over two-thirds of corpsmembers are male, and over two-thirds come from a minority group. While the average age is 18, over 85 percent cannot read above the eighth-grade level upon entering the program. Other economic indicators, such as the proportion who have

TABLE 13

JOB CORPS
CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH SERVED
PROGRAM YEAR 1987

	Percent
SEX	
Male	68.3%
Female	31.7
AGE AT ENTRY: average 18	
16 and under	21.5
17	21.9
18	19.5
19	16.3
20	11.6
21+	9.2
RACE-ETHNIC GROUP:	69.9 Minority
Black	54.8
White	30.1
Hispanic	10.2
American Indian	3.3
Asian-Pacific	1.6
ENTRY READING LEVEL:	**average grade 6**
Under Grade 3	6.3
Grade 3-4	23.8
Grade 5-6	29.9
Grade 7-8	25.9
Above Grade 8	14.1
HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT:	81.5
NEVER EMPLOYED FULL TIME:	75.9
FAMILY SIZE	
1	26.3
2-4	41.1
5 and over	32.6
FAMILIES ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE:	38.6
ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME (excluding families receiving Public Assistance)	
Under $5,000	33.1
$5,000 - $7,000	7.5
$7,000 - $9,000	7.9
Over $9,000	20.7
Average Annual Family Income	**$6,138**

Source: Job Corps In Brief: Program Year 1987, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

dropped out of high school and the level of family income, are consistent with the disadvantaged backgrounds of most corpsmembers.

2.7 Veterans Employment and Training Program

Programs for the employment and training of American veterans are authorized under Title IV-C of JTPA and supplement major veterans' programs overseen by the Veterans' Administration. Veterans' Employment and Training Service (VETS) programs serve veterans with a service-connected disability, Vietnam-era veterans, and veterans recently separated from the military. For PY 1987, $10.6 million were appropriated for Veterans' Employment and Training under JTPA. As required by regulation, 80 percent of this was granted directly to states for regular program activities; these grantees are required to match federal funding with cash or in-kind assistance. The remaining 20 percent was retained at the national level for discretionary purposes -- research and development activities, demonstration projects, and technical assistance programs that are national in scope. In PY 1987, for example, some of these funds were used for pilot projects aimed at getting homeless veterans into the workforce, and in PY 1988 for programs on post-traumatic stress disorder and programs for female veterans.

Very little data are available on the number of participants receiving different types of training through these programs. In PY 1987, almost 15,000 veterans were served through Title IV-C programs, and most of them received training.[14] The majority of veterans received

some form of job search assistance, followed by on-the-job training, and classroom training.

3. Vocational Education

Vocational education programs provide students at the secondary and postsecondary levels with training that will enable them to pursue employment in a broad range of occupations. Federal support for vocational education is authorized under the Perkins Act, which defines vocational education as follows:

> Vocational education means organized educational programs which are directly related to the preparation of individuals for paid or unpaid employment, in such fields as agriculture, business occupations, home economics, health occupations, marketing and distributive occupations, technical and emerging occupations, modern industrial and agricultural arts, and trades and industrial occupations, or for additional preparation for a career in those fields, and in other occupations requiring other than a baccalaureate or advanced degree.

Federal support for vocational education currently is approximately $888 million annually, with most of the funding distributed to states by formula. States supplement the federal funding for vocational education, but the Second Interim Report of the National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE) notes that "Little is known about the extent and nature of state authority in financing and regulatory matters beyond the criteria states establish for vocational teacher certification" (p. 2-21).[15]

The Perkins Act specifies that 57 percent of the funds are to be used for six specific target groups, and the remaining 43 percent of the funds may be used for program improvement.[16] The target groups and the mandated shares of the funds are:

Handicapped	10%
Disadvantaged students	22%
Adults in need of training	12%
Single parents or homemakers	8.5%
Programs to eliminate sex bias and stereotyping	3.5%
Criminal offenders in institutions	1%

Current law provides states with almost total flexibility in allocating funds between the secondary and postsecondary levels, and states are not required to report how they distribute funds between the secondary and postsecondary levels. NAVE sponsored a survey of the states to determine state policies; the Second Interim Report concludes that 40 percent of the Perkins Act funds are used for postsecondary vocational education, and 60 percent of the funds are used for secondary vocational education. The report indicates that there is significant variation among states, with one state spending under 10 percent of its funds at the postsecondary level, and two states spending over 90 percent of the funds at the postsecondary level.

Analysis of transcripts of a random sample of seniors from the class of 1982 by NAVE staff indicates that 97 percent of secondary school students take at least one vocational course, and that vocational enrollments account for 20 percent of the total courses taken by high school students.[17] As noted in Section 1, the focus of this study is on training that takes place outside the regular education system. We therefore do not present detailed information on secondary vocational education; the interested reader is referred to NAVE (1988a).

Data on the characteristics of vocational education students and the courses they take must be obtained from secondary sources collected for other purposes because there is currently no comprehensive reporting

system on how vocational education funds are distributed below the state level.[18] Because the Department of Education contributes a relatively small share of the resources for vocational education, it has not been able to establish a comprehensive data system for vocational education students or finances.[19] One source used by NAVE is the High School and Beyond Survey (HS&B), which tracks students who were seniors in 1980; this information may be somewhat dated, and it does not cover older students enrolled in vocational education. Data from the 1987 National Postsecondary Student Aid Survey (NPSAS) is more recent, but without conducting analyses beyond the scope of this project, we cannot isolate vocational students from others enrolled in public two-year or four-year colleges.

Based on analysis of HS&B, NAVE (1988b, p. 1-6) estimates that 61.7 percent of the class of 1980 enrolled in postsecondary education within four years of high school graduation. Using a taxonomy developed by NAVE staff, the NAVE report concludes that 37.9 percent of those who continued their education enrolled in vocational programs. The NAVE report concludes that 34.7 percent of all postsecondary credits obtained are in vocational fields. At public two-year colleges 34.7 percent of the credits are vocational, and at four-year colleges 31.9 percent of the credits are vocational, as defined by NAVE.

The NAVE taxonomy defines vocational education considerably more broadly than the definition of training provided in Section 1 of this report, and many of the students classified by NAVE as receiving postsecondary vocational education (particularly at four-year institutions) are probably not having their courses supported by federal

vocational education funds. Specifically, NAVE's definition of vocational education is based on subject matter, while our interest is in assessing training that is not part of a baccalaureate program. Thus, the NAVE definition of vocational education includes all courses in fields such as engineering, computer science, education, business, and agriculture, even if the courses are part of a degree program. The NAVE definition is likely to significantly overstate training, as we use the term, especially at the postsecondary level in four-year institutions.

Because there are no satisfactory published data on the number of students enrolled in public postsecondary vocational education as we have defined the term, the best we can do to estimate the enrollment level is to make rather crude estimates. As an upper bound, we could assume that all students enrolled in public two-year colleges are vocational students. The 1988 Digest of Education Statistics places this figure at 4.42 million students. Some of these students are enrolled in academic degree programs, but we have been unable to find published data that indicate the proportion of these students that are enrolled in vocational programs.[20]

Estimates of the characteristics of students enrolling in postsecondary vocational education based on NAVE analysis of HS&B are provided in Table 14. Note that the column on the right of the table includes students in private colleges as well as students enrolled in public vocational education programs. In the public two-year colleges, women comprise a slight majority of the students, 53.3 percent. Most of the students are white, 82.5 percent, while 9.4 percent are black, and

TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS ENTERING
POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1980

	High School Graduates	Vocational Students Public Two-Year Colleges	Students In Technical Institutes	Students In Private Vocational Schools	All Postsecondary Vocational Students
Men	49.3%	46.7%	52.5%	27.3%	45.3%
Women	50.7	53.3	47.5	72.7	54.7
White	80.8	80.9	82.5	80.0	81.1
Black	11.4	9.4	10.6	13.1	10.1
Hispanic	5.4	7.2	4.9	5.8	6.5
Other	2.3	2.5	2.0	1.1	2.3
Low SES	24.1	23.8	28.2	25.9	25.0
Middle SES	50.1	54.6	56.6	59.1	55.6
High SES	25.8	21.6	15.2	15.0	19.4
Low Ability	23.1	22.4	25.9	28.7	24.1
Middle Ability	50.4	59.5	62.5	57.0	59.5
High Ability	26.5	18.1	11.6	14.3	16.4
Academic Program	39.2	31.9	22.0	26.0	28.9
Vocational Program	24.7	29.7	41.2	45.9	34.1
General Program	36.1	38.4	36.8	28.1	36.9
Aspirations					
High School Only	18.7	8.8	12.2	14.2	9.8
Vocational Certificate	18.9	21.1	56.2	48.4	30.6
Associate Degree	15.2	33.1	18.9	6.4	29.5
Bachelor's Degree	25.6	23.0	9.4	17.8	19.1
Postgraduate Degree	21.5	13.9	3.3	13.2	11.1

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Assessment of Vocational Education. Second Interim Report to Congress. (September 1988).

7.2 percent are Hispanic. Slightly over half the students are from middle socioeconomic status (SES) backgrounds, and about 60 percent are middle ability students.

Table 15 shows the distribution of postsecondary credits for the high school class of 1980. For students enrolled at four-year colleges or public two-year colleges, more than half the credits received were for academic courses rather than vocational courses, although it should be kept in mind that this table is not restricted to vocational students. The most common vocational fields, in the NAVE taxonomy, are business courses and technical and engineering courses.

Enrollment in postsecondary vocational education is frequently not a full-time activity, and it often does not lead to obtaining an occupational credential. The NPSAS data indicate that 63.8 percent of the students in public two-year colleges are enrolled on a part-time basis. NAVE analysis of HS&B data indicates that within four years of high school graduation, only one out of five students had received a credential -- 11.4 percent received vocational associate degrees, 5.7 percent received academic associate degrees, and 2 percent received certificates. Of the other students, 42 percent left school without a degree or certificate, 13.8 percent were still enrolled at the school, and 25.2 percent had transferred to another school.

4. Senior Community Service Employment Program

The Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP), also known as the Older Workers program, is operated under the authority of Title V of the Older Americans Act. The program provides subsidized

TABLE 15

DISTRIBUTION OF POSTSECONDARY CREDITS BY FIELD
HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1980

	Public Two-Year Colleges	Public Technical Institutes	Private Vocational Schools	Four-Year Colleges	All Post-Secondary Institutions
Shares of all postsecondary credits	18.1%	6.1%	2.1%	74.1%	100.0%
Shares of all postsecondary vocational credits	30.2%	11.4%	7.5%	50.1%	100.0%
Shares of credits among curriculum areas					
Vocational	34.7%	70.4%	69.4%	31.9%	34.7%
Academic	58.3	24.9	28.1	64.6	61.1
Remedial/avocational	6.5	3.8	1.5	3.2	4.2
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Distribution by fields					
Vocational fields	34.7	70.4	69.4	31.9	34.7
Business	12.0	18.4	24.5	9.6	10.7
Marketing	1.5	1.6	4.4	1.7	1.8
Health Care	3.6	7.7	14.0	1.8	2.6
Occupational home economics	2.4	2.7	4.9	1.9	2.0
Trades and industry	3.1	15.0	7.0	1.1	2.1
Technical and engineering	6.9	17.0	10.2	6.7	7.1
Education	1.0	.4	.1	3.8	3.0
Public Service	1.1	2.0	.0	1.5	1.4
Agriculture	1.1	2.8	.4	1.2	1.2
Communications	1.9	2.9	3.9	2.6	2.5
Academic fields	58.3	24.9	28.1	64.6	61.1
Letters	12.1	5.8	6.2	9.8	10.0
Foreign Languages	1.4	.0	.1	3.4	2.8
Humanities	6.1	.6	2.3	8.6	7.7
Sciences	10.5	4.1	4.6	11.4	10.7
Mathematics	9.1	7.4	4.4	7.6	7.8
Social Sciences	14.2	6.1	4.9	16.2	15.1
Fine Arts	4.7	.8	5.6	7.1	6.3
Liberal/general studies	.3	.1	.1	.5	0.4
Remedial/avocational	6.5	3.8	1.5	3.2	4.2
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Assessment of Vocational Education. Second Interim Report to Congress, (September 1988).

part-time employment and training opportunities to individuals aged 55 and older and has a goal of placing at least 20 percent of participants in unsubsidized employment each year. SCSEP participants work an average of 20 hours per week in a variety of community service settings -- including day care centers, schools, and hospitals. Participants are generally paid the minimum wage for their work. Participants in SCSEP are also eligible for training, job-related counseling, and physical examinations.

SCSEP awards one-year grants to a number of national organizations (e.g., the National Council on the Aging and the American Association of Retired Persons) in addition to state and territorial governments. There are currently 61 grantees operating the SCSEP program. Amendments to the Older Americans Act in 1987 require that two new national organizations -- an Indian aging organization and a Pacific Island/Asian American aging organization -- be given SCSEP funds for PY 1988. Total funding for PY 1988 is set at $331.3 million, which will finance 64,807 service years. About 90,000 older workers will be served, and it is expected that 14,000 to 15,000 participants will be placed in permanent unsubsidized employment during PY 1988.

Table 16 presents summary data on program operations during for PY 1987. Enrollment during this year was 66,000 older workers, and 22 percent of this group was placed into unsubsidized employment. Over 63 percent of community service activities was for the general community, and the remainder was for services to the elderly community. Almost 70 percent of the elderly participating in the program were female, and almost 63 percent were white. Between 20 and 25 percent of participants

TABLE 16

SENIOR COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM
PROGRAM YEAR 1987

Enrollment Levels

		Percent
Established Enrollment	65,756	
Carried Over From Previous	62,695	
Newly Enrolled	37,765	
Enrollees Placed in Unsubsidized Employment	14,454	
Placement Rate		22.0%
Other Terminations	18,098	
Current Enrollment	67,908	

Expenditures to Date

Federal Funds Authorized	$355,999,996
Total Federal Share Outlays	326,105,348
Total Non-Federal Outlays	53,132,868
Administration	34,523,865
Wages & Benefits	273,602,051
Other Costs	17,979,432

Job Inventory

Services to General Community		
Education	9,743	14.3%
Health and Hospitals	3,252	4.8
Housing/Home Rehabilitation	1,057	1.6
Employment Assistance	1,451	2.1
Recreation, Parks & Forests	6,045	8.9
Environmental Quality	1,397	2.1
Public Works & Transportation	3,168	4.7
Social Services	9,837	14.5
Other	6,977	10.3
TOTAL	42,927	63.2
Services to Elderly Community		
Project Administration	1,693	2.5
Health and Home Care	2,879	4.2
Housing/Home Rehabilitation	1,098	1.6
Employment Assistance	899	1.3
Recreation/Senior Centers	5,434	8.0
Nutrition Programs	7,039	10.4
Transportation	1,546	2.3
Outreach/Referral	2,584	3.8
Other	1,809	2.7
TOTAL	24,981	36.8

Enrollee Characteristics

	Enrollment	Percent
SEX		
Male	21,006	30.9%
Female	46,902	69.1
EDUCATION		
8th & Under	18,863	27.8
9th-11th	14,466	21.3
High School	23,043	33.9
1 - 3 Years College	8,099	11.9
4 Years College	3,437	5.1
FAMILY INCOME:		
Poverty Level	54,582	80.4
Veteran	9,482	14.0
RACE/ETHNICITY		
White	42,596	62.7
Black	16,191	23.8
Hispanic	5,898	8.7
Indian/Alaskan	1,047	1.5
Asian/Pacific	2,176	3.2
AGE		
55-59	13,602	20.0
60-64	19,398	28.6
65-69	17,056	25.1
70-74	10,575	15.6
75 and Over	7,277	10.7

Source: Unpublished data, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

fell into each of the three age groups between 55 and 69, while the remaining 26 percent were aged 70 and older. No data on training services received by program participation are available.

5. Vocational Rehabilitation

The Vocational Rehabilitation program, authorized under Title I of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, provides grants to states to provide comprehensive vocational rehabilitation programs that meet the "needs of individuals with handicaps so that such individuals may prepare for and engage in gainful employment to the extent of their capabilities." Disabled individuals must satisfy a number of requirements to be eligible to participate in the program. Participants must have a physical or mental disability which can be medically described, they must have a substantial handicap to employment, and they must be capable of achieving employability (i.e., they have rehabilitation potential).

All vocational rehabilitation activities are conducted at the state level, but are reviewed and monitored by the Rehabilitation Services Administration of the U.S. Department of Education. Currently, there are 86 state agencies administering vocational rehabilitation in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, the territories and other government units.[21] Twenty-seven states have 2 agencies, one for the blind and one for people with other disabilities. In the remaining states, a single agency is responsible for all vocational rehabilitation services. In FY 1988, total Federal funding available for state grants was approximately $1.2 billion. These funds are allocated on a formula basis (depending on state population, per capita income, etc.), and

there is a state matching fund requirement (80 percent Federal and 20 percent state).

In FY 1988, approximately 918,900 individuals were served by state vocational rehabilitation agencies, and approximately 218,200 were successfully rehabilitated. Data on the characteristics of clients who were rehabilitated in FY 1985 (the most recent year for which these data are available) are shown in Table 17.[22] Almost half of all clients were between the ages of 25 and 44. Participants were more likely to be never-married, male, and white. In addition, the average participant was more likely to be severely disabled and to be a non-veteran. A significant majority, almost 85 percent, of rehabilitated clients had no earnings at referral to the program.

Although the majority of rehabilitated persons (54.1 percent) received some form of training during the course of their rehabilitation, vocational rehabilitation services are individualized to the needs of each client, and many individuals do not receive any form of training. Training is broadly defined in this program and includes education; program participants are classified as receiving training if they receive academic, business, vocational, or personal and vocational adjustment training from any source as arranged for by the state agency. Data on the total number of clients receiving training during the course of their rehabilitation and the types of training provided are shown in Table 18 for persons rehabilitated in FY 1985.[23] This group represented 64.2 percent of all active case closures in the same year.
Approximately 24 percent of rehabilitated clients received personal and vocational adjustment training, 14 percent received vocational school

TABLE 17

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION
CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS REHABILITATED
FISCAL YEAR 1985

	Total Rehabilitations	
	Number	Percent
TOTAL	227,652	
AGE AT REFERRAL		
Number reporting	218,052	100%
Under 18 Years	18,040	8.3
18-24 Years	59,085	27.1
25-44 Years	98,796	45.3
45-64	36,218	16.6
65 years and over	5,913	2.7
SEX		
Number reporting	218,915	100%
Male	123,684	56.5
Female	95,231	43.5
RACE		
Number reporting	218,366	100%
White	175,157	80.2
Black	39,404	18.0
American Indian/ Alaskan Natives	1,133	0.5
Asian and Pacific Islander	2,672	1.2
Hispanic Origin		
Number reporting	204,695	100%
Hispanic origin	13,869	6.8
Not of Hispanic origin	190,826	93.2
EDUCATION		
Number Reporting	206,347	100%
No grades completed	633	0.3
1-7 grades completed	11,213	5.4
8-11 grades completed	52,721	25.5
12 grades completed	78,162	37.9
13 grades and over completed	32,314	15.7
Special Education	31,304	15.2
MARITAL STATUS		
Number reporting	197,584	100%
Married	58,062	29.4
Widowed	7,457	3.8
Divorced	28,351	14.3
Separated	11,968	6.1
Never married	91,746	46.4
SEVERITY OF DISABILITY		
Number reporting	227,652	100%
Severely Disabled	135,229	59.4
Non-Severely Disabled	92,423	40.6
VETERAN STATUS		
Number reporting	217,872	100%
Veteran	9,182	4.2
Non-Veteran	208,690	95.8
Weekly Earnings at Referral		
Number reporting	212,174	100%
No earnings	178,423	84.1
Less than $100	12,239	5.8
$100-$199	13,409	6.3
$200 and over	8,103	3.8

Source: Annual Report of the Rehabilitation Services Administration on Federal Activities Related to the Administration of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as Amended: Fiscal Year 1987. Rehabilitation Services Administration, U.S. Department of Education.

TABLE 18

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION
TRAINING SERVICES AND COST INDICATORS
REHABILITATED CASES: FISCAL YEAR 1985

	Total Closed During Year	
	Number	Percent
TOTAL REHABILITATIONS	227,652	--
TYPE OF SERVICE PROVIDED OR ARRANGED FOR BY AGENCY[1]		
Number Reporting	205,225	100.0%
Training	110,955	54.1
College or University	20,796	10.1
Other Academic (Elementary or High School)	7,111	3.5
Business School or College	4,455	2.2
Vocational School	27,778	13.5
On-The-Job Training	15,184	7.4
Personal and Vocational Adjustment	48,218	23.5
Miscellaneous	27,583	13.4
COST OF CASE SERVICES[2]		
Number Reporting	171,209	100.0
Clients Served Without Cost	10,674	6.2
$1 - $99	21,194	12.4
$100 - $299	24,995	14.6
$300 - $599	23,458	13.7
$600 - $999	19,744	11.5
$1000 - $1999	27,162	15.9
$2000 - $2999	16,331	9.5
$3000 - $3999	9,581	5.6
$4000 and over	18,070	10.6
Mean Cost, For All Clients Reporting	$ 1,683	
Mean Cost, For Clients Served With Cost	$ 1,795	

[1] Encompasses the receipt of services by clients regardless of the source of funding. Figures are not additive because many clients receive more than one type of service.

[2] These are expenditures are made by State rehabilitation agencies for the purchase of services for clients. Excluded are administrative costs and counselor salaries.

Source: Annual Report of the Rehabilitation Services Administration on Federal Activities Related to the Administration of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as Amended: Fiscal Year 1987. Rehabilitation Services Administration, U.S. Department of Education.

training, and 10 percent trained at a college or university. Trends over the past few years indicate that the percentage of participants receiving on-the-job training, vocational school training, and personal and vocational adjustment training have increased over time, while relatively fewer participants are receiving college or university training. Although costs by detailed type of training service are not available, the Rehabilitation Services Administration reports that in FY 1986 "post-secondary instruction of higher education" cost $84.1 million, and all other types of training totaled $189.8 million.

6. Trade Adjustment Assistance

The Trade Adjustment Assistance Program (TAA), part of Title II of the 1974 Trade Act, is a support program designed to assist workers whose employment has been adversely affected by increased imports and foreign competition. Administered by the Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor through state employment security agencies, TAA provides both direct cash assistance (trade readjustment allowances -- TRA) and reemployment services -- job search, training, and relocation.

In terms of both funding and the number of people served, TAA cash assistance benefits form a large component of the program. However, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 placed greater emphasis on training and reemployment services. The Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 required participation in a job search program as a condition to receiving TRA benefits. The Omnibus Trade and

Competitiveness Act of 1988 made training, subject to certain limitations, a requirement for receiving TRA and an entitlement of displaced workers eligible for the TAA program. Enrollment in a training program is now required for receipt of TRA except for individuals who have completed a training program or receive a waiver from the state exempting them from training. Under the 1988 law, TAA participants are also entitled to receive training to the extent appropriated funds are available.

TAA training activities may include on-the-job, vocational or technical training, and remedial education. In addition, they can be provided either by government agencies or private sources. Table 19 presents the latest available data on both the income and employment service components of the TAA program. In FY 1988, $54 million were allocated to the reemployment services component of the program, compared to $186 million spent for Trade Readjustment Allowances.[24] Reemployment services were provided to almost 13,000 individuals, 10,000 of whom received training. Other types of reemployment services, such as job search assistance and relocation, were provided to 2,645 individuals.

7. Refugee Resettlement Program

The Refugee Resettlement Program, administered by the Family Support Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services, is designed to assist refugees and entrants in becoming economically self-sufficient as soon as possible following their arrival in the United States. The program offers a wide range of services including

TABLE 19

TRADE ACT ACTIVITY
FISCAL YEARS 1987 AND 1988

Trade Readjustment Allowances

Fiscal Year	Number Paid	Amount Paid (in millions)	AWBA	Duration (Weeks)
1987	55,264	$209.4	$155.00	24.3
1988	46,700	185.8	163.00	24.3

AWBA - Average Weekly Benefit Amount

Trade Adjustment Assistance

Fiscal Year	Amount Allocated (In Millions)	Number of Workers		
		Training	Job Search	Relocation
1987	$49.9	18,000*	1,864	1,518
1988	$54.3	10,300	1,160	1,485

* A significant number of workers had training costs paid with JTPA funds during the time TAA funds were not available.

Notes: - All data for FY 1987 are preliminary.

- All data for FY 1988 are provisional - based on unedited data.

Source: Unpublished data, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

cash and medical assistance, social services, and preventive health services, in addition to overseeing the Voluntary Agency Matching Grant Program and the Targeted Assistance Grant Program. The social services component of the Refugee Resettlement Program includes English language instruction and a number of employment and training activities, such as employment counselling, job placement, and vocational training, although other services (e.g., translation, and orientation) are also provided.

All persons who meet federal refugee and entrant-status requirements and who have the appropriate documentation are eligible to receive refugee social services.[25] Close to 65,000 refugees/entrants were admitted into the United States for resettlement in FY 1987, and another 76,000 were admitted in FY 1988. Although the exact number of refugees receiving all forms of program assistance is not reported, the Refugee Resettlement Program states that approximately 64,000 refugees participated in employment services in FY 1988.

Federal assistance is provided through state-level resettlement programs which are responsible for the planning, administration, and coordination of program activities. A number of voluntary resettlement agencies and refugee mutual assistance associations also receive federal funding for direct service grants. In FY 1988, $347 million of program funds were granted to states and other grantees. Of this total, $57 million were allocated on a formula basis to states for social service activities, with funding levels based on the proportion of all refugees settling in a given state during the preceding three year period. All participating states received a minimum of $75,000 regardless of the size of their refugee population.

Data on the number of participants receiving employment and training services, and on the costs of these services, are not collected at the Federal level. In response to Congress' emphasis on early employment, however, the Refugee Resettlement Program has identified a set of priority services which include English language training and activities specifically related to employment. States are required to spend 85 percent of social services funds on these activities. Thus, at least $48.5 million of total state social services allocations were spent on employment and training programs and other priority activities.

8. Welfare Work Programs

A number of employment and training programs are specifically targeted to welfare recipients. Among them is the Work Incentive Program (WIN), which was established in 1967 under amendments to Title IV Part C of the Social Security Act. The aim of WIN is to help individuals on welfare receiving benefits from the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program (AFDC) to secure and retain unsubsidized jobs, and ultimately to help these individuals become self-supporting. In addition to the regular WIN program, other types of welfare work programs are available, including WIN Demonstration programs (WIN Demos), job search programs, The Community Work Experience Program (CWEP), and Work Supplementation/Grant Diversion programs. All states operate either a WIN or a WIN Demo program, and many operate welfare work programs under AFDC demonstration authority.

Registration in a welfare work program is a basic eligibility requirement for AFDC applicants and recipients over the age of 16.[26] At

the federal level, the regular WIN program is jointly administered by the Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor and by the Family Support Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). At the state level there is a similar dual administrative structure involving the state employment service and state welfare agencies.

WIN Demos, authorized in 1981 under Title IV Part C, provide employment and training services very similar to those of the regular WIN program. The primary difference between the two programs is that the WIN demonstration option allows state welfare agencies to assume sole responsibility for the administration and oversight of the WIN Demo program. The motivation behind this option was to determine if WIN could be more effectively administered by state welfare agencies alone. In addition to WIN Demo programs, states may use AFDC demonstration authority (authorized under Title IV Part A) to conduct other programs such as job search, CWEP, and Grant Diversion.

States conducting job search programs require individuals to look for jobs while they are receiving AFDC benefits. While the programs vary across states, they typically involve providing instruction in interviewing techniques, methods of identifying jobs and completing employment applications, and other job-hunting support services.

Under the Community Work Experience Program (CWEP), states place AFDC recipients in public and private non-profit agencies so that they can develop work skills and establish a recent work history and employment references. The maximum number of required hours of work is

calculated by dividing the amount of the AFDC payment (states have the option of including Food Stamp benefits) by the minimum wage rate.

Another AFDC work program option is Work Supplementation/Grant Diversion, established in 1984. States who choose this option either use an individual's AFDC benefits as a wage subsidy to encourage employers to hire the AFDC recipient or pool AFDC payments for groups of individuals using the funds to subsidize their employment. The jobs are usually in the private sector and provide participants with work experience and income. Although the length of the subsidized employment period varies from state to state, a minimum of 9 months is required for federal matching funds. At the end of this period, many program participants obtain an unsubsidized job from their employers.

During FY 1988, 25 states (including Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the District of Columbia) had regular WIN programs, and 29 had Win Demos. Ninety-three million dollars were granted to states to administer these programs. As of September 1985, an estimated 1.6 million individuals, out of a total AFDC caseload of 3.7 million families, were registered with a WIN or a WIN Demo program. Currently, 46 states have at least one welfare work program: 33 have Job Search, 30 have CWEP, and 26 have Grant Diversion/Work Supplementation. In FY 1988, the combined costs of welfare work programs for all states reporting was $178 million.[27] Half of this total, $89 million, came from federal grants. Since states provide different combinations of programs and different types of services within each program, it is not clear how much of the total costs were devoted to training per se, although it appears that training activities are limited to short-term

job search assistance and subsidized employment activities. National estimates for FY 1987 indicate that monthly participation in CWEP was 49,000 individuals, and in job search, 171,000 individuals.[28]

The WIN program will only be in effect until October 1, 1990. Title II of the Family Support Act of 1988 will replace WIN with the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program (JOBS). The Act requires all states to implement the program which will "assure that needy families with children obtain the education, training, and employment that will help them avoid longterm welfare." A broad range of activities will be available through the JOBS program, including education, job training, and readiness activities. In addition, at least two of the following must be made available to JOBS participants: job search, CWEP or other work experience, grant diversion, and on-the-job training. As with WIN, program participation is required for non-exempt AFDC recipients.

9. The Food Stamp Employment and Training Program

The Food Security Act of 1985 required states to implement an Employment and Training (E&T) Program for their food stamp recipients by April of 1987. The purpose of the program is to assist able-bodied recipients in securing paid employment and in reducing their dependence on food stamps. At the federal level, the E&T program is administered by the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, whose primary role is to approve and monitor state-level program activities. The legislation was designed to give states maximum flexibility in designing their Food Stamp E&T program. States are free, subject to USDA approval, to determine the range of services provided

through the program, which parts of the program are mandatory and which are voluntary, who is required to participate and who may participate in the program, and the level of program funding in excess of the basic Federal grant.[29]

A wide variety of services are available through state Food Stamp E&T programs. The most common are job search assistance, offered by 49 of the 53 state agencies (including the District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands), and job search training, provided by 39 state agencies.[30] More intensive services are also provided in many states: 33 agencies provide adult basic education, 33 provide vocational training, 14 provide work experience, and 8 provide workfare. Another 18 agencies provide other types of services such as on-the-job training, supported employment, vocational rehabilitation, and home-based employment. These services are delivered through a number of different channels, including traditional employment and training service agencies, such as the state employment security agencies and JTPA programs, local school districts, community colleges, and both public and private community organizations such as Goodwill and the Young Men's Christian Association.

About one million were served by the Food Stamp E&T program in FY 1988. Fifty-eight thousand of these individuals were volunteers, while the remaining participants were mandatory non-exempt registrants.

For the evaluation of E&T, data were collected from a nationally representative sample of 13,000 individuals eligible to participate in the program. The distribution of this sample by various socioeconomic characteristics is shown in Table 20. The majority of participants are

between the ages of 22 and 40. The average age is 33 years. Over 60 percent of program participants are from minority groups and there are an equal number of males and females. The majority of participants are single and living alone. The educational background of E&T participants is generally quite low -- fewer than one-half of all participants have completed high school. Data on participants' employment experience show that fewer than one-half have worked any time during the preceding year, and 17 percent have never worked. Although the majority of participants live in a household in which only the participant is involved in the E&T program, over 15 percent live in households in which more than one individual is a Food Stamp E&T participant. The percentage of households receiving income from various sources, such as General Assistance (41 percent), AFDC (6 percent), and public housing assistance (2 percent) is also shown in Table 20.

Federal funding for the Food Stamp E&T program totaled $108.8 million in FY 1988. This figure includes $60 million for the basic federal grant allocated to states on the basis of the relative size of their food stamp program caseloads, $36.3 million for federal matching funds for additional program services, and $12.5 million for participant reimbursement.

10. Summary and Conclusions

This section summarizes our findings on the major federally supported training programs and provides the implications for policy

TABLE 20

FOOD STAMP EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM
DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS
FISCAL YEAR 1988

	Percent
Age	
21 years or younger	13%
22 - 40 years	60
41 years and older	27
Sex	
Male	50%
Female	50
Race/Ethnicity	
White non-Hispanic	39%
Black non-Hispanic	53
Hispanic	7
Other	1
Marital Status	
Married	17%
Divorced/widowed/separated	30
Never-married	53
Education	
Less than grade 12	54%
High school graduate	37
Some college	8
College graduate	1
Labor Market Experience	
Worked during last 12 months	43%
Did not work during last 12 months	40
Never worked	17
Household Size	
1 person	54%
2 persons	21
3 persons	9
4 persons	8
5 or more persons	8
Household Composition	
Single person	54%
Two married adults with child(ren)	11
Two married adults	10
Single female with child(ren)	9
Other	17
Number of E&T Participants in Household	
1 participant	84%
2 participants	13
3 or more participants	3
Percent of E&T Participant Households Receiving Income from Various Sources at Time of Application/Recertification	
General Assistance	41%
Earnings	19
Social Security/Pensions	8
AFDC	6
Medicaid	6
Child Support	3
Unemployment Income	2
Public Housing	2
Other Housing Assistance	2

Note: Figures are based on data collected from a nationally representative sample of about 13,000 individuals eligible to participate in E&T.

Source: Evaluation of the Food Stamp Employment and Training Program: Report to Congress on Program Implementation, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.: December, 1988.

consideration. No judgments are made on the merits of individual programs because we have not conducted benefit-cost analyses on the programs.

1. There are 14 major programs that provide some degree of vocational training to participants and the two largest programs are the postsecondary vocational education program and the Title II-A program of the Job Training Partnership Act.

Table 21 lists the major training programs identified and provides information on federal expenditures and the number of participants. The largest programs are JTPA Title II-A training for economically disadvantaged youth and adults, and postsecondary vocational education. Vocational education serves the most participants, possibly as many as 4.2 million per year, and Title II-A of JTPA serves over 1.3 million participants per year. Federal expenditures for the JTPA Title II-A program are more than five times as large as for postsecondary vocational education ($1.9 billion for JTPA compared to an estimated $355 million for postsecondary vocational education). The reason for discrepancies between costs and enrollments is that JTPA is entirely federally funded, while vocational education receives only partial funding from the federal government.

All the training programs except vocational education have eligibility requirements. There are maximum income levels for eligibility for the JTPA Title II-A program, the summer youth program, the Job Corps, the Senior Community Service Employment Program, the Food Stamp Employment and Training Program, and the AFDC welfare work

Table 21

SUMMARY OF GOVERNMENT-PROVIDED TRAINING PROGRAMS

Program	Year	Federal Outlays[a] (millions)	Number of Participants Receiving: Training and Related Services	Number of Participants Receiving: Core Training
JTPA Title II-A	FY[b] 1987	$ 1,900	1,331,144	286,000 [c,d]
Summer Youth Program	FY[e] 1988	287 [f]	689,862 [g]	n/a
JTPA Title III	FY 1987	172	183,229	27,700 [d]
Native American Program	FY 1987	27 [f] 9.8 [h]	32,904	9,501 [c]
Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Program	FY 1987	42 [f] 18.8 [h]	18,187 [i]	6,536 [i]
Job Corps	FY 1987	34.6 [j] 73.1 [k]	103,806	103,806
Veterans' Employment and Training	FY 1987	10.6	15,000 [l]	n/a
Vocational Education	FY 1988	335.2 [m]	n/a [n]	n/a [n]
Senior Community Service Employment Program	FY 1987	326	65,756	n/a
Vocational Rehabilitation	FY 1988	1,200	918,900 [l]	n/a
Trade Adjustment Assistance	FY 1988	54.3 [o]	12,945	10,300
Refugee Resettlement Program	FY 1987	48.5 [p]	64,000	n/a
WIN/WIN Demo	FY 1988	92.5	1,600,000 [q]	n/a
Other Welfare Work [r]	FY 1988	89	48,654 [s] 170,653 [t]	n/a
Food Stamp E&T Program	FY 1988	108.8 [u]	1,006,000	n/a

[a] Program total, unless training costs are available.
[b] Program year (July 1 - June 30).
[c] May include basic skills education.
[d] Number of FY 1987 enrollees with classroom training as initial program assignment.
[e] Fiscal Year (October 1- September 30).
[f] Training costs only.
[g] Agency has no formal definition of training; figures are self-reported.
[h] Classroom training.
[i] Number of terminees receiving service.
[j] Basic education.
[k] Vocational training.
[l] All program participants.
[m] Forty percent of $888 million for postsecondary vocational education.
[n] Number of participants may be as high as 4 million; accurate data are not available.
[o] Not including TRA benefits.
[p] Social service funding for priority services, not limited to training.
[q] Number of registrants as of September 1985.
[r] Job Search, CWEP, Grant Diversion/Work Supplementation.
[s] CWEP only, FY 1987 monthly participation.
[t] Job Search only, FY 1987 monthly participation.
[u] Includes $12.5 million in participant reimbursements.

programs. The remaining programs have eligibility requirements based on personal characteristics, e.g., farmworkers, Native Americans, individuals with disabilities, service in the armed forces, and loss of a job because of imports, a plant closing, or a major layoff. Nine of the programs are administered through the Department of Labor, two are administered through the Department of Health and Human Services (refugee resettlement and welfare work), two programs are administered through the Department of Education (vocational education and vocational rehabilitation), and the Food Stamp E&T program is administered by the Department of Agriculture.

A natural policy issue is whether there is a need for so many programs. Most of the programs serve special target groups, and it may be more efficient to serve these groups through distinct programs. There is coordination of the nine Department of Labor programs because they are all administered by the same cabinet department, and most are in the same agency (the Employment and Training Administration). The Reagan Administration proposed abolishing the TAA program and serving the affected workers under Title III of JTPA, but Congress has continued both programs.

The greatest overlap appears to be between the two largest programs -- the JTPA Title II-A program and postsecondary vocational education. Both programs provide occupational classroom training, and in many instances community colleges provide the training for both programs.

2. The data available on participants and services provided are very limited for many of the programs and it is not always possible to determine the number of participants, their characteristics, or the services they receive.

With the exception of the Job Training Partnership Act programs, it is often difficult, if not impossible, to obtain data on the characteristics of program participants and the services they receive. The most severe data gaps are for the vocational education program where one cannot tell how many individuals received services financed partly or completely with federal funds. To obtain estimates, the NAVE staff had to commission special studies (to find the split between postsecondary and secondary vocational education) and analyze longitudinal data bases collected for other purposes.

Many of the programs maintain little data on training provided, or they do not differentiate between vocational training and basic skills training. In some cases this is because training is not a major goal of the program (e.g., welfare work programs). However, it is difficult to make an assessment of the adequacy of the mix of training programs without some knowledge of the services being offered.

Data collection is not inexpensive, and serious consideration should be given before any major efforts are initiated. In addition, the Paperwork Reduction Act requires that the benefits of any data collection effort be weighed against the costs. However, the other large programs (such as vocational education and welfare work programs) should consider the development of comprehensive data collection systems similar to the ones used by the Department of Labor for the Title II-A

and Title III programs.[31] Such data need not be collected annually if cost is a major concern.

3. Many of the participants in "training" programs do not receive occupational classroom training.

None of the programs considered spend as much as half their funds on classroom occupational training, and it is not clear that the proportion should necessarily be increased. In vocational education, for example, students take academic as well as vocational courses, and the mix of both types of courses may prepare the students better for the labor market. In JTPA Title II-A programs, many participants receive job search assistance, on-the-job training, or basic skills training rather than occupational classroom training, but these types of services may be more appropriate for them.

The point is not that too little occupational training is being provided. Rather, occupational classroom training is one of a number of approaches that can be used to prepare individuals for the labor market. The most commonly used approaches are:

- Basic skills and remedial education. Given the increasing needs for workers who can read and perform arithmetic satisfactorily, JTPA, vocational education, and other programs sometimes provide basic skills and remedial education to participants who lack such skills.

- Classroom training. Workers who possess adequate basic skills can gain the specific skills required by employers by enrolling in a special class.

- Work experience and community work experience programs (CWEP). These programs are typically offered to individuals with limited work experience. The programs are expected to provide personal

skills to the participants and provide them with credentials for unsubsidized jobs. In the case of work experience, the programs also provide financial support; CWEP is sometimes used as a quid pro quo for receiving AFDC benefits.

- On-the-job training, grant diversion, and work supplementation. These programs provide jobs with private-sector employers. They are frequently used for workers with most of the skills needed for a job and who are expected to gain any additional skills needed within six to nine months of subsidized employment.

- Job search assistance. These programs are used for employable workers who need assistance in how to seek work and present themselves at interviews.

Depending upon an individual's experience and attributes, one or more of the approaches may be most effective. Additionally, the costs of the various approaches span a large range -- job search assistance can be quite inexpensive, but subsidizing a worker's wages for six months in on-the-job training can easily cost ten times as much. The efficiency tradeoff between costs and benefits must be considered as well as the equity tradeoff between serving a large number of participants with inexpensive services rather than serving a smaller number of participants with richer services. The former tradeoff can be resolved through effective evaluations, but the equity issue requires policy consideration.

4. Few of the training programs have formal links with employers to assure that the training and related services meet employer needs.

We did not conduct a formal large-scale survey to address the issue of integration of program content with employer needs, but it

appears that few of the programs have instituted formal methods of integrating the programs with the needs of employers. The major exception is the JTPA program, where the private industry councils (PICs) for each local program must review and approve the training plans. Although the evidence from available research studies does not indicate that the PICs have had a dramatic influence on the programs, the preponderance of the evidence does appear to show that the private industry councils have helped to integrate the content of training programs with the needs of the private sector. Consideration should be given to developing similar formal linkages in other major training programs.

NOTES

1. Unlike most federal programs, JTPA operates on a program-year basis, rather than a fiscal-year basis. The program year begins July 1 of the same calendar year, i.e., program year 1987 begins July 1, 1987.

2. All costs incurred under performance-based contracts are considered training expenses. In addition, Section 108 of the Act lists certain conditions when the 30 percent cap can be exceeded.

3. Unless otherwise noted, all data on JTPA Title II-A participants are based on the Job Training Quarterly Survey (JTQS), a quarterly survey based on a random sample of participants. The data are reported in U.S. Department of Labor (1988).

4. The low levels of work experience may result from statutory limitations on the proportion of funds that SDAs may spend on non-training services.

5. Youth aged 14 and 15 may also participate in Title II-B programs if they are included in service delivery area (SDA) job training plan.

6. Unpublished data from the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

7. JTPA specifies three criteria for identifying dislocated workers. These are workers who: (1) have been terminated or laid off or have received a notice of termination or lay-off from employment, are eligible for or have exhausted their entitlement to unemployment compensation, and are unlikely to return to their previous industry or occupation; (2) have been terminated, or who have received a notice of termination of employment as a result of any permanent closure of a plant or facility; or (3) are long-term unemployed and have limited opportunities for employment or reemployment in the same or a similar occupation in the area in which such individuals reside, including any older individuals who may have substantial barriers to employment by reason of age. Amendments to JTPA in 1986 extended eligibility to formerly self-employed workers, e.g., dislocated ranchers and farmers.

8. Unpublished data from the Office of Special Targeted Programs, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

9. Unpublished data from the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

10. Unpublished data from the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1989.

11. See Job Corps in Brief: Program Year 1987, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1988.

12. These Job Corps centers are also called Civilian Conservation Centers (CCCs) since they are modeled on the New Deal's Civilian Conservation Corps. CCCs are usually located on public lands (e.g., national parks and forests) and conduct environmental and natural resource projects.

13. See Job Corps In Brief: Program Year 1987, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1988.

14. Unpublished data from the Veterans Employment and Training Service, U.S. Department of Labor.

15. Some sources indicate that federal funds provide about 10 percent of all funding for vocational education. There does not appear to be adequate documentation to support or refute this conjecture.

16. Program improvement includes a number of uses, but it is believed that a majority of the funds are used for purchasing equipment.

17. A major factor in the high participation rate in vocational education at the secondary level is that 65 percent of all high school graduates take typing.

18. The Department of Education formerly collected information on students enrolled in vocational education through the Vocational Education Data System (VEDS), but the system was discontinued several years ago because of data quality problems.

19. The Department of Education is currently developing a system to obtain data on vocational education students based on surveys and other secondary sources such as the High School and Beyond Survey. The system is referred to as Data on Vocational Education (DOVE).

20. NAVE staff indicated that The High School and Beyond survey could be used to estimate the proportion of students who self-report that they are enrolled in nonbaccalaureate programs, but there may be significant self-reporting errors.

21. See Annual Report of the Rehabilitation Services Administration on Federal Activities Related to the Administration of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, As Amended: Fiscal Year 1987, U.S. Department of Education, Rehabilitation Services Administration, 1988.

22. Note that since these data only apply to cases which were closed during FY 1985, they may not exactly reflect the total population of individuals being served by the program.

23. Closures from the active caseload are classified as rehabilitated if they satisfy the following conditions: (1) have been declared eligible for services, (2) have received appropriate diagnostic and related

services, (3) have had a program for VR services formulated, (4) have completed the program, (5) have been provided counseling, and (6) have been determined to be suitably employed for a minimum of 60 days.

24. Unpublished data from the Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

25. In order to enter the United States as a refugee, a person must have been persecuted or have a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; be of the types of refugees of special humanitarian concern to the United States; be admissable under U.S. law; and must not be firmly resettled in any foreign country.

26. Individuals are exempt if they are unable to participate due to illness, incapacity, advanced age, full-time student status, remoteness from a work incentive (WIN) program site, the need to care for an ill or incapacitated member of household, or working at least 30 hours per week. A parent caring for a child under the age of 6 is also exempt and in two-parent family, one parent is exempt if the second parent is working.

27. Unpublished data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

28. Background Material and Data on Programs within the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, 1989 Edition. U.S. House of Representatives.

29. Evaluation of the Food Stamp Employment and Training Program: Report to Congress on Program Implementation, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C.: December 1988.

30. Data on the types and costs of services provided by the Food Stamp E&T programs are based on state plans submitted to FNS for FY 1988, required state quarterly performance reports for FY 1988, and an inventory of program operations for a nationally representative sample of 55 Food Stamp Agencies participating in an evaluation study of the E&T program. Program operations planned by states and estimated costs may not reflect actual FY 1988 service and financial characteristics.

31. The Department of Labor collects JTPA data through an administrative reporting system, the JTPA Annual Status Report (JASR) and obtains more detailed data on participants with a random sample through the Job Training Quarterly System (JTQS).

REFERENCES

National Commission for Employment Policy. The Job Training Partnership Act. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1987.

National Commission for Employment Policy. JTPA Performance Standards: Effects on Clients Services and Costs. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1988.

U.S. Department of Education. National Assessment of Vocational Education. First Interim Report from the National Assessment of Vocational Education, January 1988. Washington, DC: 1988.

U.S. Department of Education. National Assessment of Vocational Education. Second Interim Report from the National Assessment of Vocational Education, September 1988. Washington, DC: 1988.

U.S. Department of Education. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. National Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics, 1988. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988.

U.S. Department of Education. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. National Center for Education Statistics. Undergraduate Financing of Post Secondary Education: A Report of the 1987 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, June 1988.

U.S. Department of Education. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services. Rehabilitation Services Administration. Annual Report of the Rehabilitation Services Administration on Federal Activities Related to the Administration of the

Rehabilitation Act of 1973, As Amended, Fiscal Year 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Family Support Administration. Office of Refugee Resettlement. Report to the Congress: Refugee Resettlement Program. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988.

U.S. Department of Labor. Division of Performance Management and Evaluation. Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Development. Summary of JTQS Data for JTPA Title II-A and III Enrollments and Terminations During PY 1987. Washington DC: December 1988.

U.S. Department of Labor. Employment and Training Administration. Job Corps in Brief, Program Year 1987. Washington, DC: 1988.

U.S. House of Representatives. Committee on Ways and Means. Background Material and Data on Programs within the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, 1988 Edition. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988.